

REMARKS

The Office Action mailed April 25, 2005, in view of the Decision of the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences (“Board Decision”) mailed March 25, 2011, has been reviewed and these remarks are responsive thereto. Claims 1-8 and 25 have been canceled in the present paper. Claims 28-36 are new. No new matter has been added. Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-4, 8-14, and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. pat. no. 5,751,282 (“Girard”) in view of U.S. pub. no. 2002/0112007 (“Wood”). Claims 5 and 6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Girard, in view of Wood, and further in view of U.S. pat. no. 5,589,892 (“Knee”). Claims 7 and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Girard, in view of Wood, and further in view of U.S. pub. no. 2001/0016947 (“Nishikawa”). Claim 15 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Girard, in view of Wood, and further in view of U.S. pat. no. 6,642,939 (“Vallone”). Claim 18 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Girard, in view of Wood, and further in view of U.S. pat. no. 5,606,374 (“Bertram”). Claims 19-21 and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. pat. no. 6,182,287 (“Schneidewend”), in view of Bertram, and further in view of U.S. pub. no. 2001/0030959 (“Ozawa”). Claims 22-24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schneidewend, in view of Bertram and Ozawa, and further in view of Nishikawa. These rejections are traversed below.

Independent claim 19 (as amended) recites, among other features, “receiving a broadcast stream at a terminal, the broadcast stream comprising a network address.” As reflected in the Board Decision at page 9, at most Schneidewend describes that a user pre-selects “favorite” network addresses, and thus, such network addresses would not have been included in a broadcast stream. Claim 19 is distinguishable from the applied documents for at least the foregoing reasons.

Amended independent claim 9 recites, among other features, “receiving, from the terminal, a request based on a network address included in the broadcast content.” Such features are distinguishable from the applied documents for at least reasons substantially similar to those discussed above with respect to claim 19.

The dependent claims are distinguishable from the applied documents for at least the same reasons as their respective base claims, and further in view of the unique combinations of features recited therein.

CONCLUSION

If any fees are required or if an overpayment is made, the Commissioner is authorized to debit or credit Deposit Account No. 19-0733, accordingly.

All rejections having been addressed, Applicants respectfully submit that the instant application is in condition for allowance, and respectfully solicit prompt notification of the same.

Respectfully submitted,

BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

Dated: May 20, 2011

By: /Mark E. Wilinski/

Mark E. Wilinski

Registration No. 63,230

1100 13th Street, N.W., Suite 1200

Washington, D.C. 20005-4051

Tel: (202) 824-3000

Fax: (202) 824-3001